

Message

From: Konkus, John [konkus.john@epa.gov]
Sent: 10/25/2018 2:29:08 PM
To: Beck, Nancy [Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]; Baptist, Erik [Baptist.Erik@epa.gov]; Bertrand, Charlotte [Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov]
CC: Block, Molly [block.molly@epa.gov]; Abboud, Michael [abboud.michael@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

OK will do.

From: Beck, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 10:29 AM
To: Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>
Cc: Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

Although you should also confirm with OW because they may be moving so fast we in OCSPP may not be aware on certain aspects.

Thanks John!

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
P: 202-564-1273
beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Konkus, John
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 10:28 AM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>
Cc: Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

Thank you.

From: Beck, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 10:27 AM
To: Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>
Cc: Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

Yes. thanks.

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
P: 202-564-1273
beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Konkus, John
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 10:23 AM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>
Cc: Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

This is good. I expect more general PFAS inquiries asking where we are in the process, etc. Is this response good for those as well?

From: Beck, Nancy
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 10:04 AM
To: Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>
Cc: Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

A few suggestions below. I know it's a bit wordy but how the tox values will be used will depend not only on the exposure information but also the regulation/statute which will dictate how this information is considered. Different program offices could come up with different responses depending on the statutory authority.

Also- do we need to call out the desire for industry input? Perhaps delete that clause as they will engage regardless..

Charlotte/Erik- any suggestions to this?

Thanks.

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
P: 202-564-1273
beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Konkus, John
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2018 8:14 AM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>; Baptist, Erik <Baptist.Erik@epa.gov>; Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>
Cc: Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>
Subject: FOR REVIEW // Response to Politico on PFAS

Charlotte, Nancy and Erik: Good morning. Ryan asked that you all please review and edit this draft response to Politico's question below. The reporter's deadline is later today. Thank you.

Draft Response

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Annie Snider [mailto:asnider@politico.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2018 4:37 PM

To: Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>

Cc: Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>; Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>

Subject: Responsible Science Policy Coalition & PFOA/PFOS

Ryan, I am looking into a group called the Responsible Science Policy Coalition that has been lobbying on PFOA/PFOS regulation, questioning the science around the chemicals causing harm to humans. I understand the group, and its primary backer, 3M, came into EPA for at least two meetings with Richard Yamada over the late summer/early fall, and possibly others with the water office, and that this is a matter that's on your radar. My sense is that there is a divide within industry about how to approach this issue; obviously ACC is on the record backing the current EPA approach to evaluating and possibly regulating the two legacy chemicals.

I'm hoping you can comment on a few things for me:

- 1 – confirm that EPA officials have met with the group
- 2 – comment on their line of argument – that PFOA and PFOS aren't proven to be harmful to humans at current exposure levels
- 3 – comment on what influence industry will have in the EPA process of evaluating the chemicals and potentially proceeding with regulations. Industry sources tell me that part of the reason much of the chemicals industry is on board with the EPA efforts is because they think the Trump administration will produce industry-friendly standards.

I'm shooting to wrap up reporting by COB tomorrow. I'm on my cell if you want to discuss.

Best,
Annie